

Amendment Sheet

---

**4 10/2004/029**

ENGLISH NATURE are content they support the view that the wildlife reports recommendations are conditioned. SOMERSET WILDLIFE TRUST recommend that the survey report recommendations be secured through conditions or obligations.

Additional conditions re maintenance of barn swallow access to the piggery and if work not commenced for a year a further survey shall be commissioned for bats or bird usage before works commence.

Additional notes re wildlife mitigation and drainage.

---

**6 23/2004/051**

PARISH COUNCIL support the principle of development in this area but consider that the detailed application should include the following conditions:- (1) a maximum of 4 dwellings to be constructed as indicated by the outline drawing; (2) a single entrance to the plot to ensure an adequate visibility splay for safety purposes; (3) a pavement across the front of the plot to ensure the safety of pedestrians using Butts Way; (4) appropriate landscaping and screening to reduce overlooking and visual impact on the properties opposite.

---

**9 31/2004/029**

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY Location:- The development proposed is adjacent to the A358 National Primary Route, and close to the junction 25 of the M5. The A358 at this location is the 3rd busiest road within the County of Somerset. The site is located outside the development limits, and is not located within safe walking distance of food shops. Ruishton does not have the benefit of a shop, and to reach the nearest shop the crossing of the M5 slip roads would be required. I would not want to increase pedestrians crossing at this point. Bus stops with lay-bys are located within walking distance of the proposed development and experience a reasonable standard of service (frequent links to Taunton at less than 60 minutes

between intervals). However, one of the bus stops is located on the southern side of the A358 opposite the Blackbrook Public House (140 m approximately from proposed access), and even though a pedestrian refuge is available, crossing the A358 is considered hazardous, even by the most able bodied. I would not want to increase pedestrians crossing at this point. There are two public houses near the proposed development, the Ruishton Inn is situated approximately 350 m from the proposed access, footway links to Ruishton do not exist and the road is unsuitable for pedestrians, considering the road width along with two way traffic. The Blackbrook is within walking distance of the proposals although a designated crossing point on Ruishton Lane would be required to ensure improved pedestrian safety. The site is located outside the limits of a settlement in an area which is remote from employment, leisure, retail and convenience shops. The nearest Post Office is approximately 1.6 km away, while Sainsbury's is 1.2 km away, secondary and tertiary health care is located within Taunton, and all are outside the walking distance quoted in PPG10. The development, if approved, will increase the reliance on private motor vehicle and foster growth in the need to travel. This is contrary to advice given in PPG13, RPG10 and Policies STR1 and STR6 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review. The proposed development does not meet the accessibility criteria for residential development as set out in Annex A of RPG10. Therefore, due to the issues stated above this development would be classed as unsustainable in terms of transport policy. It is unlikely that the location of this development would encourage walking or cycling, and therefore would increase reliance on the private motor vehicle. Access:- No objection to the access proposals in principle as an existing access will be removed from the busy A358 National Primary Route and adequate visibility is demonstrated in the new location. Although, the proposed footway detail would need amending to link in with the existing arrangements. Traffic Assessment:- The trip generation stated in the Transport Assessment, would indicate that an increase in peak hours flows is unlikely. Whilst I agree with this, further investigation would be required as to the impact on the existing junction of Ruishton Lane with the A358 National Primary Route, and how pedestrians will cross the A358 satisfactory to access public transport links, whilst not interrupting the free flow of traffic on a National Primary Route in accordance with the Traffic Management Act. Therefore, I would recommend refusal on this application on highway grounds due to the following reason:- The site is located outside the limits of a settlement in an area which is remote from employment, leisure, retail and convenience shops, etc, and will therefore increase the need for journeys to be made by private motor vehicles which is non-sustainable and in conflict with the advice given in PPG13, and the provisions of Policy STR1 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review and Policy S1(B) of the Taunton Deane Local Plan.

1 ADDITIONAL LETTER OF OBJECTION on grounds of location east of M5, new access will worsen situation at Ruishton Lane junction of A358.

Additional refusal reason on grounds of sustainability as per above.

---

**10 38/2004/570**

As amended by drawings attached to applicants letters dated 26th January, 2005, 4th February, 2005 and 8th February, 2005.

Further letter from applicant stating that they would be prepared to make further additional changes:- With regard to the Dormer Windows, we propose that these are omitted on the elevations noted below, and that we revert to Velux, but utilising the combined vertical and pitched elements, as this would alleviate the overlooking issue whilst meeting Building Regulations and environmental considerations. Substitute combination Velux to southwest elevation for plots 22-34 inclusive (facing Clarence Street), and northwest elevation to plots 36 and 49 (facing Portland Street). Please note that all the outward facing accommodation above ground floor is bedroom i.e. on-habitable rooms (Building Regulations definition).

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY I would refer you to previous correspondence in connection with Planning Application No 38/04/00324 and 38/04/570 I would advise you that these comments have still not been resolved (in particular points 3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 22 on the letter dated 15 December 2004). I can advise you that from a highway point of view there is no objection to this proposal in principle and it is essential that the detail is amended to satisfy our requirements, hence the inclusion of condition 6 below. In the event of permission being granted I would recommend that the following conditions are imposed: (1) The proposed estate roads, footways, footpaths, cycleways, bus stops/bus lay-bys, verges, junctions, street lighting, sewers, drains, retaining walls, service routes, surface water outfall, vehicle overhang margins, embankments, visibility splays, accesses, carriageway gradients, drive gradients, drive gradients, car parking and street furniture shall be constructed and laid out in accordance with details to be approved by the local planning authority in writing before their construction begins. For this purpose, plans and sections, indicating as appropriate, the design, layout, levels, gradients, materials and method of construction shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. (2) The proposed roads, including footpaths and turning spaces where applicable, shall be constructed in such a manner as to ensure that each dwelling before it is occupied shall be served by a properly consolidated and surfaced footpath and carriageway to at least base course level between the dwelling and existing highway. (3) In the interests of sustainable development none of the dwellings hereby approved shall be occupied until a network of footpaths has been constructed within the development site in accordance with a scheme to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. (4) At the proposed access there shall be no obstruction to visibility greater than 300 mm above adjoining road level within the visibility splays shown on the submitted plan. Such visibility splays shall be constructed prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted and shall thereafter be maintained at all times. (5) Provision shall be made within the site for the disposal of surface water so as to prevent its discharge onto the highway, details of which shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such drainage shall be provided prior to the development first being brought into use. (6) No part of the development hereby

permitted shall be carried out until the plan at a scale of not less than 1:200 showing the proposed layout of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and to be fully implemented to the satisfaction of the said Authority. In the event of permission being granted I would recommend that the following note is attached to the planning certificate: Mote: Having regard to the powers of the Highway Authority under the Highways Act 1980 the applicant is advised that a Section 184 Permit must be obtained from the Highway Service Manager, Sedgemoor Area, Dunball Industrial Estate, Bridgwater, TA6 4TP. Application for such a Permit should be made at least three weeks before access works are intended to commence.

20 FURTHER LETTERS AND A PETITION WITH 28 SIGNATURES OBJECTING on the following grounds:- loss of privacy; noise and dust during construction; traffic congestion; subsidence caused to neighbouring properties; impact on crime and disorder; density greater than Government guidelines; loss of vehicular access to rear of properties; three storey properties inappropriate; too close to rear of neighbouring properties; loss of light; landscaping will do little to mitigate impact.

Additional conditions as suggested by County Highway Authority.

Amended Recommendation:- Subject to revised drawings in accordance with amendments suggestion in applicants letter dated 11th February, 2005 and the completion of a Section 106 agreement ... (as printed)

---

**11      38/2004/574**

The applicant has confirmed that surface water drainage can use the existing combined sewer as the area is already hardsurfaced and its development would not result in additional run off. The paving areas shall have open joints to minimise run off.

Amended Recommendation:- Remove the proposed drainage condition and replace it with a condition to ensure paving has open joints.

---

Copies to:  
CHAIR/NTN/TB/JM/CDW/AG/DA/JH/KM/JLH/IC/TAB/CJW/HM/H&L/RWF/  
Planning Reception/JJ/RB/17 Committee Members/15 Public